

REMARKS

Applicant cancelled claims 16-18. Applicant respectfully requests examination of pending claims 1-18.

5 **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

 The Examiner rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,549,957 (Hanson) in view of Nielsen et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,870,548. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The teachings of Hanson or Nielsen do not show the currently claimed invention of independent claims 1, 6, and 11. For instance, computing and storing a first representative value for said first composite message when the email server does not receive a confirmation from a client in response to a receipt message sent by the server. In the claimed invention, the server needs to store the representative value for any message whose transmission session did not end normally. When the server does not receive a confirmation message from the client after the server sent a receipt message to indicate that the server received the entire first message, a representative value for the first message is stored. Then, a second representative value is computed for a second message, which arrived subsequent to the first message. The second representative value is compared with the first representative value to determine whether the second message is a duplication of the first message. The second message is forwarded to an email recipient, only if the second message is not a duplication of the first. Thereafter, at least one of the stored representative value is discarded based on a predetermined criterion.

 In contrast, Hanson teaches a method of preventing a received message from triggering the generation and forwarding of a new message, thereby avoiding the

creation of a network chain reaction or maelstrom (Abstract). According to Hanson, a maelstrom can be viewed as a chain reaction in which a single message can unintentionally trigger the generation of a large rapidly growing, potentially infinite number of messages (column 1, lines 2-24). Therefore, Hanson is not teaching to
5 prevent the duplication of messages caused by the miscommunication between the client and the server. As such, Hanson does not teach a method recited by the Applicant's claims.

The examiner acknowledges that the Hanson does not teach preventing duplication of messages caused by the miscommunication between the client and the
10 server. The Examiner then cites Nielsen, and asserts that Nielsen teaches receiving a confirmation from a client in response to a receipt message sent by the email server. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion. The confirmation in the portions relied on by the Examiner refers to a confirmation message sent to the sender of an email, that the email message has been canceled with/without the recipient of
15 the message seeing the message. In fact, Nielsen teaches a mechanism for canceling or modifying a previously sent email message that has passed beyond the scope of the sender's email system. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Nielsen does not teach the features described above with respect to the claimed invention as the Examiner proposed.


20 Nevertheless, the Applicant respectfully submit that even if the digital data processing system of Hanson and the system and method for providing email system with the capability to act on previously-sent messages by Nielsen were combinable (a proposition with which the Applicant disagree), the combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest claimed invention. The claimed inventions defines a method for an

email server to reduce the unintended duplication of messages forwarded to an email recipient, caused by the miscommunication between the client and the server.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not anticipate independent claims 1, 6, and 11. Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15, each of which depends directly or indirectly from amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hanson in view of Nielsen for at least the same reasons set forth for amended independent claims 1, 6, and 11.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 774-6926.

If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP505). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

Jaya Nair, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,454

Martine Penilla & Gencarella, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32291